

[6th February 1924]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I want to put a supplementary question to the hon. the Home Member. If I remember rightly, the total number of people convicted was something like 30 to 32 thousands. But I see the number of appeals disposed of is only 1,775. For obvious reasons probably many have not come up with appeals. Practically I see that one-fifth were either acquitted or had their sentences reduced. Would it not be, Sir, gracious on the part of the Government if they pursue now a generous policy of remission of sentences as prayed for by Resolutions numerously signed?"

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP:—"I am not quite sure whether this is a request for information; it seems to be rather a recommendation. I remember, Sir, that your predecessor has reminded the House that anything which is not a request for information should take the form of a Resolution."

Mappilla rebels fined under the suspended sentence scheme.

164 Q.—Mr. K. UPPI SAHIB: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

- (a) how many Mappillas have been fined under the suspended sentence scheme for offences connected with the rebellion;
- (b) what is the total amount of fine so levied;
- (c) how much has been already collected;
- (d) how many of the Mappillas so fined have made default in paying the fine; and
- (e) how many of them have been imprisoned for such default?

- A.—(a) 17,688 up to the end of December 1923.
 (b) Rs. 10,11,234-6-6 up to end of December 1923.
 (c) Rs. 6,14,228-15-9 up to end of December 1923.
 (d) 2,279, excluding one taluk for which figures are not yet ready.
 (e) 424 up to 30th November 1923.

Medical Service.

Compulsory retirement of Sub-Assistant Surgeons.

165 Q.—Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) whether it is a fact that Sub-Assistant Surgeons who were compelled to retire under the Retrenchment scheme were not permitted to avail themselves of any kind of leave before retirement though they might be entitled to the same and that a special Government Order was issued to that effect;

(2) if the answer to the above be in the affirmative, whether the hon. the Minister will be pleased to lay on the table the Government Order in question;

(3) whether it is a fact that officers of less than fifty years of age and thirty years of service were made to retire, while those who were older and had put in longer service were retained; and

(4) whether it is a fact that the local boards were given the option to employ their own Sub-Assistant Surgeons in medical institutions under their charge except taluk headquarter hospitals?